arXiv:0906.4255v1 [math.OA] 23 Jun 2009

Subproduct systems of Hilbert spaces: dimension two

Boris Tsirelson

Abstract

A subproduct system of two-dimensional Hilbert spaces can generate an Arveson system of type I_1 only. All possible cases are classified up to isomorphism. This work is triggered by a question of Bhat: can a subproduct system of n-dimensional Hilbert spaces generate an Arveson system of type *II* or *III*? The question is still open for $n > 2$.

Contents

1 Discrete time **1**
2 Time on a sublattice **8**
3 Rational time **9**
4 Arveson systems, Liebscher continuity **12**
References **16**

1 Discrete time

Subproduct systems of Hilbert spaces and Hilbert modules are introduced recently by Shalit and Solel [5] and Bhat and Mukherjee [3].

In this section, by a subproduct system I mean a discrete-time subproduct system of two-dimensional Hilbert spaces (over $\mathbb{C}$), defined as follows.

1.1 Definition. A *subproduct system* consists of two-dimensional Hilbert spaces E_t for $t = 1, 2, \dots$ and isometric linear maps

$$\beta_{s,t} : E_{s+t} \to E_s \otimes E_t$$

for $s, t \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$, satisfying the associativity condition: the diagram[1]

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & E_{r+s+t} \arrow[dl, "\beta_{r+s,t}"'] \arrow[dr, "\beta_{r,s+t}"] & \\
E_{r+s} \otimes E_t \arrow[dr, "\beta_{r,s}\otimes\mathbf{1}_t"'] & & E_r \otimes E_{s+t} \arrow[dl, "\mathbf{1}_r\otimes\beta_{s,t}"] \\
 & E_r \otimes E_s \otimes E_t &
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative for all $r, s, t \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$.

1.2 Proposition. For every subproduct system there exist vectors $x_t, y_t \in E_t$ for $t = 1, 2, \ldots$ such that one and only one of the following five conditions is satisfied.

(1) There exists $a \in [0, 1)$ such that for all $s, t \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$

$$\|x_t\| = \|y_t\| = 1\,, \quad \langle x_t, y_t\rangle = a^t\,,$$
$$\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes x_t\,, \quad \beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t}) = y_s \otimes y_t\,.$$

(2) There exists $a \in [0, 1)$ such that for all $s, t \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$

$$\|x_t\| = \|y_t\| = 1\,, \quad \langle x_t, y_t\rangle = a^t\,,$$
$$\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = \begin{cases} x_s \otimes x_t & \text{if } s \text{ is even,} \\ x_s \otimes y_t & \text{if } s \text{ is odd,} \end{cases} \quad \beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t}) = \begin{cases} y_s \otimes y_t & \text{if } s \text{ is even,} \\ y_s \otimes x_t & \text{if } s \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

(3) There exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ such that for all $s, t \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$

$$\|x_t\| = 1\,, \quad \|y_t\|^2 = 1 + |\lambda|^2 + |\lambda|^4 + \cdots + |\lambda|^{2t-2}\,, \quad \langle x_t, y_t\rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes x_t\,, \quad \beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t}) = y_s \otimes x_t + \lambda^s x_s \otimes y_t\,.$$

(4) For all $s, t \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$

$$\|x_t\| = \|y_t\| = 1\,, \quad \langle x_t, y_t\rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes x_t\,, \quad \beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t}) = y_s \otimes x_t\,.$$

(5) For all $s, t \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$

$$\|x_t\| = \|y_t\| = 1\,, \quad \langle x_t, y_t\rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes x_t\,, \quad \beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes y_t\,.$$

---

[1] Of course, $\mathbb{1}_t : E_t \to E_t$ is the identity map.

Proof. The five conditions evidently are pairwise inconsistent; we have to prove that at least one of them is satisfied.

Ignoring the metric, that is, treating the Hilbert spaces E_t as just linear spaces, and using the classification given in [6, Sect. 7] we get linearly independent vectors $x_t, y_t \in E_t$ that satisfy the formulas for $\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t})$ and $\beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t})$ but maybe violate the formulas for $\|x_t\|$, $\|y_t\|$ and $\langle x_t, y_t \rangle$.

We postpone Case 3 and consider Cases 1, 2, 4 and 5. The right-hand sides of the formulas for $\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t})$ and $\beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t})$ are tensor products. Taking into account that generally the relation $x = y \otimes z \ne 0$ implies

$$\frac{x}{\|x\|} = \frac{y}{\|y\|} \otimes \frac{z}{\|z\|} \,,$$

we normalize x_t, y_t (dividing each vector by its norm). Thus,

$$\|x_t\| = \|y_t\| = 1 \quad \text{for all } t \,.$$

Case 1. We have $\langle x_{s+t}, y_{s+t} \rangle = \langle \beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}), \beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t}) \rangle = \langle x_s \otimes x_t, y_s \otimes y_t \rangle = \langle x_s, y_s \rangle \langle x_t, y_t \rangle$, therefore

$$\langle x_t, y_t \rangle = a^t \quad \text{for all } t \,,$$

where $a = \langle x_1, y_1 \rangle$, $|a| < 1$. Replacing y_t with $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}t\varphi} y_t$ for an appropriate φ we get $a \in [0, 1)$.

Case 2. Denoting $\langle x_t, y_t \rangle$ by c_t we have

$$c_{s+t} = \begin{cases} c_s c_t & \text{if } s \text{ is even,} \\ c_s \overline{c}_t & \text{if } s \text{ is odd,} \end{cases}$$

thus $c_{2n} = |c_1|^{2n}$, $c_{2n+1} = c_1 |c_1|^{2n}$. Replacing x_{2n+1} with $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\varphi} x_{2n+1}$ and y_{2n+1} with $\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\varphi} y_{2n+1}$ for an appropriate φ we get $c_1 \in [0, 1)$.

Case 4. We have $\langle x_{s+t}, y_{s+t} \rangle = \langle x_s, y_s \rangle$, thus $\langle x_t, y_t \rangle = \langle x_1, y_1 \rangle$. Replacing y_t with

$$\frac{y_t - \langle y_t, x_t \rangle x_t}{\| y_t - \langle y_t, x_t \rangle x_t \|} = \frac{y_t - \langle y_1, x_1 \rangle x_t}{\| y_t - \langle y_1, x_1 \rangle x_t \|}$$

we get $\langle x_t, y_t \rangle = 0$.

Case 5 is similar to Case 4.

The rest of the proof treats Case 3.

First, we may prove the condition $\|y_t\|^2 = 1 + |\lambda|^2 + \dots + |\lambda|^{2t-2}$ for $t = 1$ only (that is, just $\|y_1\| = 1$), since the other conditions imply

$$\|y_{s+t}\|^2 = \|\beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t})\|^2 = \|y_s \otimes x_t\|^2 + \|\lambda^s x_s \otimes y_t\|^2 = \|y_s\|^2 + |\lambda|^{2s} \|y_t\|^2 \,.$$

Second, the condition $\|y_1\| = 1$ can be ensured by dividing all y_t by $\|y_1\|$. Thus, we need not bother about $\|y_t\|$.

We still can normalize vectors x_t (but not y_t), since $\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes x_t$. Thus,

$$\|x_t\| = 1 \quad \text{for all } t\,.$$

Denoting $\langle x_t, y_t \rangle$ by c_t we have

$$c_{s+t} = c_s + \lambda^s c_t\,.$$

Sub-case 3a: $\lambda = 1$. We have $c_{s+t} = c_s + c_t$, thus $c_t = tc_1$ for all t. Replacing y_t with $y_t - tc_1 x_t$ we get $\langle x_t, y_t \rangle = 0$.

Sub-case 3b: $\lambda \ne 1$. We may replace y_t with $y_t + a(\lambda^t - 1)x_t$ (a will be chosen later), since

$$\begin{aligned} &\beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t} + a(\lambda^{s+t} - 1)x_{s+t}) = \\ &\qquad = y_s \otimes x_t + \lambda^s x_s \otimes y_t + a(\lambda^{s+t} - 1)x_s \otimes x_t = \\ &\qquad\quad = (y_s + a(\lambda^s - 1)x_s) \otimes x_t + \lambda^s x_s \otimes (y_t + a(\lambda^t - 1)x_t)\,. \end{aligned}$$

An appropriate choice of a gives $c_1 = 0$ and therefore $c_t = 0$ for all t. □

A system of vectors x_t, y_t cannot satisfy more than one of the five conditions of Theorem 1.2, and moreover, the corresponding parameter (a or λ, if any) is determined uniquely. We say that a system $(x_t, y_t)_{t=1,2,\dots}$ is a *basis* of type $\mathcal{E}_1(a)$ if it satisfies Condition (1) of Theorem 1.2 with the given parameter a. Bases of types $\mathcal{E}_2(a)$, $\mathcal{E}_3(\lambda)$, $\mathcal{E}_4$ and $\mathcal{E}_5$ are defined similarly. By Theorem 1.2, every subproduct system has a basis. It can have many bases, but they all are of the same type, which will be shown in Lemma 1.4.

1.3 Definition. An *isomorphism* between two subproduct systems $(E_t, \beta_{s,t})$ and $(F_t, \gamma_{s,t})$ consists of unitary operators $\theta_t : E_t \to F_t$ for $t = 1, 2, \dots$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} E_{s+t} \arrow[r, "\beta_{s,t}"] \arrow[d, "\theta_{s+t}"'] & E_s \otimes E_t \arrow[d, "\theta_s \otimes \theta_t"] \\ F_{s+t} \arrow[r, "\gamma_{s,t}"] & F_s \otimes F_t \end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative for all $t \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$.

Subproduct systems having a basis of type $\mathcal{E}_1(a)$ for a given a evidently exist and evidently are mutually isomorphic. The same holds for the other types. Up to isomorphism we have subproduct systems

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{E}_1(a) & \text{for } a \in [0,1)\,, \\ \mathcal{E}_2(a) & \text{for } a \in [0,1)\,, \\ \mathcal{E}_3(\lambda) & \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}\,, \\ \mathcal{E}_4\,, & \\ \mathcal{E}_5\,. & \end{array}$$

1.4 Lemma. The subproduct systems listed above are mutually non-isomorphic.

Proof. Ignoring the metric we get subproduct systems of linear spaces classified in [6, Sect. 7]:

subproduct system of Hilbert spaces	subproduct system of linear spaces, according to [6]
$\mathcal{E}_1(a)$	$\mathcal{E}_1$
$\mathcal{E}_2(a)$	$\mathcal{E}_2$
$\mathcal{E}_3(\lambda)$	$\mathcal{E}_3(\lambda)$
$\mathcal{E}_4$	$\mathcal{E}_4$
$\mathcal{E}_5$	$\mathcal{E}_5$

Isomorphism between subproduct systems of linear spaces is necessary for isomorphism between subproduct systems of Hilbert spaces. It remains to prove that $\mathcal{E}_1(a)$ and $\mathcal{E}_1(b)$ are isomorphic for $a = b$ only, and the same for $\mathcal{E}_2(a), \mathcal{E}_2(b)$.

Case $\mathcal{E}_1(a)$. All product vectors in $\beta_{1,1}(E_2)$ are of the form $cx_1 \otimes x_1$ or $cy_1 \otimes y_1$ ($c \in \mathbb{C}$), see [6, Lemma 3.2]. Two one-dimensional subspaces of E_1 are thus singled out. The cosine of the angle between them is an invariant, equal to the parameter a.

Case $\mathcal{E}_2(a)$ is similar. □

1.5 Theorem. Every subproduct system is isomorphic to one and only one of the subproduct systems $\mathcal{E}_1(a)$, $\mathcal{E}_2(a)$, $\mathcal{E}_3(\lambda)$, $\mathcal{E}_4$, $\mathcal{E}_5$.

Proof. Combine Prop. 1.2 and Lemma 1.4. □

An automorphism of a subproduct system is its isomorphism to itself. Given a basis $(x_t, y_t)_t$ of a subproduct system, each automorphism $(\theta_t)_t$ transforms it into another basis $(\theta_t x_t, \theta_t y_t)_t$, which leads to a bijective correspondence between bases and automorphisms (as long as the initial basis is kept fixed). All automorphisms are described below in terms of a given basis $(x_t, y_t)_t$. All bases are thus described.

Every subproduct system admits automorphisms

$$\theta_t = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ct} \cdot 1\!\!1_t \tag{1.6}$$

for $c \in [0, 2\pi)$, called trivial automorphisms. They commute with all automorphisms.

The systems $\mathcal{E}_1(a)$ and $\mathcal{E}_2(a)$ admit a nontrivial automorphism

$$\theta_t x_t = y_t\,, \quad \theta_t y_t = x_t\,. \tag{1.7}$$

The system $\mathcal{E}_1(0)$ (that is, $\mathcal{E}_1(a)$ for $a = 0$) admits nontrivial automorphisms

$$\theta_t x_t = x_t\,, \quad \theta_t y_t = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}bt} y_t \tag{1.8}$$

for $b \in [0, 2\pi)$. The system $\mathcal{E}_2(0)$ admits nontrivial automorphisms

$$\begin{gathered} \theta_{2n} x_{2n} = x_{2n}\,, \quad \theta_{2n} y_{2n} = y_{2n}\,, \\ \theta_{2n-1} x_{2n-1} = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}b} x_{2n-1}\,, \quad \theta_{2n-1} y_{2n-1} = \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}b} y_{2n-1} \end{gathered} \tag{1.9}$$

for $b \in [0, 2\pi)$.

The systems $\mathcal{E}_3(\lambda)$, $\mathcal{E}_4$ and $\mathcal{E}_5$ admit nontrivial automorphisms

$$\theta_t x_t = x_t\,, \quad \theta_t y_t = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}b} y_t \tag{1.10}$$

for $b \in [0, 2\pi)$.

1.11 Lemma. For the systems $\mathcal{E}_1(a)$ and $\mathcal{E}_2(a)$ with $a \neq 0$, every automorphism is the composition of a trivial automorphism and possibly the automorphism (1.7).

For the system $\mathcal{E}_1(0)$, every automorphism is the composition of a trivial automorphism, possibly the automorphism (1.7), and possibly an automorphism of the form (1.8).

For the system $\mathcal{E}_2(0)$, every automorphism is the composition of a trivial automorphism, possibly the automorphism (1.7), and possibly an automorphism of the form (1.9).

For the systems $\mathcal{E}_3(\lambda)$, $\mathcal{E}_4$ and $\mathcal{E}_5$, every automorphism is the composition of a trivial automorphism and possibly an automorphism of the form (1.10).

Proof. By the definition of automorphism, $\beta_{s,t}(\theta_{s+t}u) = (\theta_s \otimes \theta_t)(\beta_{s,t}(u))$ for all $u \in E_{s+t}$.

For $\mathcal{E}_4$ we have $\beta_{s,t}(E_{s+t}) = E_s \otimes x_t$, therefore $\theta_t x_t = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}c_t} x_t$ for some c_t. The relation $\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes x_t$ implies $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}c_{s+t}} = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}c_s}\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}c_t}$, since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}c_{s+t}} x_s \otimes x_t = \beta_{s,t}\big(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}c_{s+t}} x_{s+t}\big) = \\ = \beta_{s+t}\big(\theta_{s+t} x_{s+t}\big) = (\theta_s \otimes \theta_t)(\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t})) = \\ = (\theta_s \otimes \theta_t)(x_s \otimes x_t) = (\theta_s x_s) \otimes (\theta_t x_t) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}c_s} x_s \otimes \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}c_t} x_t\,; \end{aligned}$$

thus, $\theta_t x_t = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ct} x_t$. On the other hand, $\theta_t y_t = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\alpha_t} y_t$ for some α_t, since $\theta_t y_t$ is a unit vector orthogonal to $\theta_t x_t$. The relation $\beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t}) = y_s \otimes x_t$ implies $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\alpha_{s+t}} = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\alpha_s} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ct}$; thus $\theta_t y_t = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}b} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ct} y_t$ where $b = \alpha_1 - c$.

For $\mathcal{E}_5$ the proof is similar.

For $\mathcal{E}_3(\lambda)$ we note that all product vectors in $\beta_{s,t}(E_{s+t})$ are collinear to $x_s \otimes x_t$ (see [6, Lemma 3.3]), therefore $\theta_t x_t = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}c_t} x_t$ for some c_t. As before, the relation $\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes x_t$ implies $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}c_{s+t}} = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}c_s} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}c_t}$, thus $\theta_t x_t = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ct} x_t$. On the other hand, $\theta_t y_t = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\alpha_t} y_t$ for some α_t, since $\theta_t y_t$ is a vector orthogonal to $\theta_t x_t$. As before, the relation $\beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t}) = y_s \otimes x_t + \lambda^s x_s \otimes y_t$ implies

$$\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\alpha_{s+t}} (y_s \otimes x_t + \lambda^s x_s \otimes y_t) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\alpha_s} y_s \otimes \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ct} x_t + \lambda^s \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}cs} x_s \otimes \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\alpha_t} y_t \,,$$

therefore $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\alpha_{s+t}} = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\alpha_s} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ct}$ and $\theta_t y_t = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}b} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ct} y_t$.

For $\mathcal{E}_1(a)$ we recall the argument used in the proof of Lemma 1.4: two one-dimensional subspaces are singled out; $\theta_t x_t$ must be either $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}c_t} x_t$ or $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}c_t} y_t$, and the same holds for $\theta_t y_t$. The relation $\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes x_t$ implies $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}c_{s+t}} = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}c_s} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}c_t}$ as before, but it also shows that the choice of x or y must conform at s, t and $s+t$, which means that either $\theta_t x_t = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ct} x_t$ for all t, or $\theta_t x_t = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ct} y_t$ for all t. Accordingly, in the first case $\theta_t y_t = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}dt} y_t$ for all t, while in the second case $\theta_t y_t = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}dt} x_t$ for all t.

Assume for now that $a \ne 0$. The relation $\langle x_t, y_t \rangle = a^t$ gives $\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ct} \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}dt} = 1$ and so, $d = c$. The first case leads to the trivial automorphism

$$\theta_t(x_t) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ct} x_t \,, \quad \theta_t(y_t) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ct} y_t \,.$$

The second case leads to

$$\theta_t(x_t) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ct} y_t \,, \quad \theta_t(y_t) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ct} x_t \,,$$

the composition of a trivial automorphism and (1.7).

Assume now that $a = 0$. The first case leads to

$$\theta_t(x_t) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ct} x_t \,, \quad \theta_t(y_t) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}dt} y_t \,,$$

the composition of a trivial automorphism and (1.8). The second case leads to

$$\theta_t(x_t) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}ct} y_t \,, \quad \theta_t(y_t) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}dt} x_t \,,$$

the composition of a trivial automorphism, (1.7) and (1.8).

For $\mathcal{E}_2(a)$: this case is left to the reader. (It will be excluded in Sect. 3, anyway.) $\square$

2 Time on a sublattice

Let $(E_t, \beta_{s,t})_{s,t}$ be a subproduct system, and $m \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$. Restricting ourselves to $E_m, E_{2m}, \dots$ we get another subproduct system $(E_{mt}, \beta_{ms,mt})_{s,t}$. The type of the new system is uniquely determined by the type of the original system:

$$\begin{array}{cc}
\text{type of } (E_t)_t & \text{type of } (E_{mt})_t \\
 & \\
\mathcal{E}_1(a) & \mathcal{E}_1(a^m) \\
\mathcal{E}_2(a) & \begin{cases} \mathcal{E}_1(a^m) & \text{if } m \text{ is even,} \\ \mathcal{E}_2(a^m) & \text{if } m \text{ is odd} \end{cases} \\
\mathcal{E}_3(\lambda) & \mathcal{E}_3(\lambda^m) \\
\mathcal{E}_4 & \mathcal{E}_4 \\
\mathcal{E}_5 & \mathcal{E}_5
\end{array} \tag{2.1}$$

Here and later on I abbreviate $(E_t, \beta_{s,t})_{s,t}$ to $(E_t)_t$. The proof of (2.1) is straightforward: every basis $b = (x_t, y_t)_t$ of $(E_t)_t$ leads naturally to a basis $R_m(b)$ of $(E_{mt})_t$, namely,

$$R_m : (x_t, y_t)_t \mapsto (x_{mt}, y_{mt})_t \tag{2.2}$$

when $(E_t)_t$ is of type $\mathcal{E}_1(a)$, $\mathcal{E}_2(a)$, $\mathcal{E}_4$ or $\mathcal{E}_5$, and

$$R_m : (x_t, y_t)_t \mapsto \Big(x_{mt}, \frac{1}{\|y_m\|} y_{mt} \Big)_t \tag{2.3}$$

when $(E_t)_t$ is of type $\mathcal{E}_3(\lambda)$.

Every automorphism $\Theta = (\theta_t)_t$ of $(E_t)_t$ leads naturally to an automorphism $S_m(\Theta) = (\theta_{mt})_t$ of $(E_{mt})_t$. Clearly,

$$R_m\big(\Theta(b)\big) = (S_m(\Theta))\big(R_m(b)\big) \,,$$

where automorphisms act naturally on bases:

$$\Theta(b) = (\theta_t x_t, \theta_t y_t)_t \quad \text{for } \Theta = (\theta_t)_t \text{ and } b = (x_t, y_t)_t \,.$$

Note also that

$$R_{mn}(b) = R_m(R_n(b)) \,, \tag{2.4}$$

and $S_{mn}(\Theta) = S_m(S_n(\Theta))$ for all m, n, b and Θ.

The map S_m is a homomorphism from the group of automorphisms of $(E_t)_t$ to the group of automorphisms of $(E_{mt})_t$.

2.5 Lemma. For every m the homomorphism S_m is an epimorphism. That is, every automorphism of $(E_{mt})_t$ is of the form $S_m(\Theta)$.

Proof. By Lemma 1.11, every automorphism of $(E_{mt})_t$ is the product of automorphisms written out explicitly in (1.6)–(1.10). It is sufficient to check that each factor is of the form $S_m(\Theta)$. The check, left to the reader, is straightforward. (The case $\mathcal{E}_2(a)$ will be excluded in Sect. 3, anyway.) $\square$

2.6 Corollary. For every m the map R_m is surjective. That is, every basis of $(E_{mt})_t$ is of the form $R_m(b)$ where b is a basis of $(E_t)_t$.

Proof. Let b_0 be a basis of $(E_t)_t$ and Θ run over all automorphisms of $(E_t)_t$, then $S_m(\Theta)$ runs over all automorphisms of $(E_{mt})_t$, therefore $R_m(\Theta(b_0)) = (S_m(\Theta))(R_m(b_0))$ runs over all bases of $(E_{mt})_t$. $\square$

3 Rational time

In this section the object introduced by Def. 1.1 will be called a *discrete-time subproduct system.* A *rational-time subproduct system* is defined similarly; in this case the variables r, s, t of Def. 1.1 run over the set $\mathbb{Q}_+ = \mathbb{Q} \cap (0,\infty)$ of all positive rational numbers (rather than the set $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \mathbb{Z} \cap (0,\infty)$ of all positive integers).

3.1 Theorem. For every rational-time subproduct system there exist vectors $x_t, y_t \in E_t$ for $t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$ such that one and only one of the following four conditions (numbered 1, 3, 4, 5) is satisfied.

(1) There exists $a \in [0,1)$ such that for all $s,t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$

$$\|x_t\| = \|y_t\| = 1\,, \quad \langle x_t, y_t \rangle = a^t\,,$$
$$\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes x_t\,, \quad \beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t}) = y_s \otimes y_t\,.$$

(3) There exist $c \in (0,\infty)$ and a family $(\eta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Q}_+}$ of numbers $\eta_t \in \mathbb{C}$ such that for all $s,t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$ we have $|\eta_t| = 1$, $\eta_{s+t} = \eta_s \eta_t$ and

$$\|x_t\| = 1\,, \quad \langle x_t, y_t \rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\|y_t\|^2 = \begin{cases} t & \text{if } c = 1, \\ (c^{2t}-1)/(c^2-1) & \text{if } c \ne 1; \end{cases}$$
$$\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes x_t\,, \quad \beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t}) = y_s \otimes x_t + c^s \eta_s x_s \otimes y_t\,.$$

(4) For all $s,t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$

$$\|x_t\| = \|y_t\| = 1\,, \quad \langle x_t, y_t \rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes x_t\,, \quad \beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t}) = y_s \otimes x_t\,.$$

(5) For all $s, t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$

$$\|x_t\| = \|y_t\| = 1\,, \quad \langle x_t, y_t \rangle = 0\,,$$
$$\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes x_t\,, \quad \beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes y_t\,.$$

Proof. For each $n = 1, 2, \dots$ we consider the restriction of $(E_t)_{t \in Q_+}$ to $t \in \{1/n!, 2/n!, \dots\}$, the discrete-time subproduct system $(E_{t/n!})_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$. The systems $(E_{t/(n+1)!})_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ and $(E_{t/n!})_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ are related as described in Sect. 2 (with $m = n+1$). The first of such systems, $(E_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$, can be of type $\mathcal{E}_1(a)$, $\mathcal{E}_3(\lambda)$, $\mathcal{E}_4$ or $\mathcal{E}_5$ but not $\mathcal{E}_2(a)$ (since there is no corresponding type of $(E_{t/2})_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$). We postpone the case $\mathcal{E}_3(\lambda)$ and assume for now that $(E_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is of type $\mathcal{E}_1(a)$, $\mathcal{E}_4$ or $\mathcal{E}_5$. Accordingly, the n-th of these systems, $(E_{t/n!})_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$, is of type $\mathcal{E}_1(a^{1/n!})$, $\mathcal{E}_4$ or $\mathcal{E}_5$. Using Corollary 2.6 we choose for each $n = 1, 2, \dots$ a basis $b_{1/n!}$ of $(E_{t/n!})_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ such that $R_{n+1}(b_{1/(n+1)!}) = b_{1/n!}$ for each n.

Every $r \in \mathbb{Q}_+$ is of the form $k_n/n!$ for n large enough. The basis $b_r = R_{k_n}(b_{1/n!})$ of $(E_{rt})_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ does not depend on n due to (2.4). For the same reason,

$$b_{mr} = R_m(b_r) \quad \text{for all } r \in \mathbb{Q}_+ \text{ and } m = 1, 2, \dots$$

We introduce $x_{rt}^{(r)}, y_{rt}^{(r)} \in E_{rt}$ for $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ by

$$b_r = \big(x_{rt}^{(r)}, y_{rt}^{(r)} \big)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+}\,.$$

Case $\mathcal{E}_4$: by (2.2),

$$\big(x_{mrt}^{(mr)}, y_{mrt}^{(mr)} \big)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} = b_{mr} = R_m(b_r) = \big(x_{mrt}^{(r)}, y_{mrt}^{(r)} \big)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+}\,,$$

that is, $x_{mrt}^{(mr)} = x_{mrt}^{(r)} = x_{mrt}$ depends only on mrt; vectors $x_t \in E_t$ for $t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$ are thus defined. The same holds for y_t. Clearly, $\|x_t\| = \|y_t\| = 1$ and $\langle x_t, y_t \rangle = 0$. The relation $\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes x_t$ for $s, t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$ follows from the relation

$$\beta_{k/n!, l/n!}\big(x_{(k+l)/n!}^{(1/n!)} \big) = x_{k/n!}^{(1/n!)} \otimes x_{l/n!}^{(1/n!)}$$

for $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and n large enough. The same holds for y.

Case $\mathcal{E}_5$ is similar.

Case $\mathcal{E}_1(a)$: as before, (2.2) leads to $x_t, y_t \in E_t$ for $t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$; also $\|x_t\| = \|y_t\| = 1$, and $\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes x_t$, $\beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t}) = y_s \otimes y_t$. The relation $\langle x_t, y_t \rangle = a^t$ follows from the relation

$$\langle x_{k/n!}^{(1/n!)}, y_{k/n!}^{(1/n!)} \rangle = \big(a^{1/n!} \big)^k$$

for the system $(E_{t/n!})_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ of type $\mathcal{E}_1(a^{1/n!})$.

Case $\mathcal{E}_3(\lambda)$: the system $(E_{t/n!})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ is of type $\mathcal{E}_3(\lambda_{1/n!})$ for some $\lambda_{1/n!} \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$ satisfying $\lambda_{1/n!}^{n!} = \lambda$ and $\lambda_{1/(n+1)!}^{n+1} = \lambda_{1/n!}$. We define λ_r for all $r \in \mathbb{Q}_+$ by $\lambda_{k/n!} = \lambda_{1/n!}^k$ and get $\lambda_{r+s} = \lambda_r\lambda_s$ and $|\lambda_s| = |\lambda|^s$. By (2.3),

$$\big(x_{mrt}^{(mr)}, y_{mrt}^{(mr)}\big)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}_+} = b_{mr} = R_m(b_r) = \Big(x_{mrt}^{(r)}, \frac{1}{\|y_{mr}^{(r)}\|} y_{mrt}^{(r)}\Big)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}_+} ;$$

taking $r = \frac{1}{(n+1)!}$ and $m = n+1$ we get for $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$

$$x_{t/n!}^{(1/n!)} = x_{t/n!}^{(1/(n+1)!)} , \quad y_{t/n!}^{(1/n!)} = \frac{1}{\|y_{1/n!}^{(1/(n+1)!)}\|} y_{t/n!}^{(1/(n+1)!)} .$$

We define x_r for all $r \in \mathbb{Q}_+$ by $x_{t/n!} = x_{t/n!}^{(1/n!)}$ and get $\beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes x_t$ as before; however, y needs more effort. We have

$$\|y_{1/n!}^{(1/(n+1)!)}\|^2 = \|y_{(n+1)/(n+1)!}^{(1/(n+1)!)}\|^2 = 1 + c^{2/(n+1)!} + \dots + c^{2n/(n+1)!} ,$$

where $c = |\lambda|$.

Sub-case $c = 1$: we note that $\|y_{1/n!}^{(1/(n+1)!)}\|^2 = n+1$ implies

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}} y_{t/n!}^{(1/n!)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n+1)!}} y_{(n+1)t/(n+1)!}^{(1/(n+1)!)} ,$$

define y_r for all $r \in \mathbb{Q}_+$ by

$$y_{t/n!} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}} y_{t/n!}^{(1/n!)}$$

and get for $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$

$$\|y_{t/n!}\|^2 = \frac{1}{n!}\|y_{t/n!}^{(1/n!)}\|^2 = \frac{t}{n!} ,$$

that is, $\|y_t\|^2 = t$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$. The relation

$$\beta_{k/n!,l/n!}\big(y_{(k+l)/n!}^{(1/n!)}\big) = y_{k/n!}^{(1/n!)} \otimes x_{l/n!}^{(1/n!)} + \lambda_{1/n!}^k x_{k/n!}^{(1/n!)} \otimes y_{l/n!}^{(1/n!)}$$

implies $\beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t}) = y_s \otimes x_t + \lambda_s x_s \otimes y_t$. It remains to define η_s by

$$\lambda_s = |\lambda_s|\eta_s = c^s\eta_s .$$

Sub-case $c \neq 1$: only the calculations related to $\|y_t\|$ must be reconsidered. We note that

$$\|y_{1/n!}^{(1/(n+1)!)}\|^2 = \frac{c^{2/n!} - 1}{c^{2/(n+1)!} - 1}$$

implies

$$\sqrt{c^{2/n!}-1}\,y_{t/n!}^{(1/n!)} = \sqrt{c^{2/(n+1)!}-1}\,y_{(n+1)t/(n+1)!}^{(1/(n+1)!)}\,,$$

define y_r for all $r \in \mathbb{Q}_+$ by

$$y_{t/n!} = \sqrt{\frac{c^{2/n!}-1}{c^2-1}}\,y_{t/n!}^{(1/n!)} \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$$

and get

$$\|y_{t/n!}\|^2 = \frac{c^{2/n!}-1}{c^2-1} \cdot \frac{c^{2t/n!}-1}{c^{2/n!}-1} = \frac{c^{2t/n!}-1}{c^2-1} \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{Z}_+\,,$$

that is, $\|y_t\|^2 = (c^{2t}-1)/(c^2-1)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$. □

4 Arveson systems, Liebscher continuity

An Arveson system, or product system of Hilbert spaces, consists of separable Hilbert spaces $\tilde{E}_t$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+ = (0,\infty)$ and unitary operators

$$\tilde{\beta}_{s,t} : \tilde{E}_{s+t} \to \tilde{E}_s \otimes \tilde{E}_t$$

for $s,t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, satisfying well-known conditions, see [1, Def. 3.1.1].

4.1 Definition. Let $(E_t, \beta_{s,t})_{s,t\in\mathbb{Q}_+}$ be a rational-time subproduct system (as defined in Sect. 3) and $(\tilde{E}_t, \tilde{\beta}_{s,t})_{s,t\in\mathbb{R}_+}$ an Arveson system. A *representation* of the subproduct system in the Arveson system consists of linear isometric embeddings

$$\alpha_t : E_t \to \tilde{E}_t \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$$

such that the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
E_{s+t} \arrow[r, "\beta_{s,t}"] \arrow[d, "\alpha_{s+t}"'] & E_s \otimes E_t \arrow[d, "\alpha_s\otimes\alpha_t"] \\
\tilde{E}_{s+t} \arrow[r, "\tilde{\beta}_{s,t}"] & \tilde{E}_s \otimes \tilde{E}_t
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative for all $s,t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$.

Denote by $\xi_{s,t} : E_s \otimes E_t \to E_t \otimes E_s$ the unitary exchange operator, $\xi_{s,t}(f \otimes g) = g \otimes f$.

4.2 Proposition. If $(E_t, \beta_{s,t})_{s,t \in \mathbb{Q}_+}$ admits a representation (in some Arveson system) then for every $h \in E_1$ the function

$$t \mapsto \begin{cases} \langle \beta_{t,1-t}(h), \xi_{1-t,t}\beta_{1-t,t}(h) \rangle & \text{for } t \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0,1), \\ \|h\|^2 & \text{for } t \in \{0,1\} \end{cases}$$

is uniformly continuous on $\mathbb{Q} \cap [0,1]$.

Proof. By a theorem of Liebscher [4, Th. 7.7], for every Arveson system $(\tilde{E}_t, \tilde{\beta}_{s,t})_{s,t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ the unitary operators $U_t : \tilde{E}_1 \to \tilde{E}_1$ defined for $t \in (0,1)$ by

$$\tilde{\beta}_{t,1-t}(U_t \tilde{h}) = \tilde{\xi}_{1-t,t} \tilde{\beta}_{1-t,t}(\tilde{h}) \quad \text{for } \tilde{h} \in \tilde{E}_1$$

are a strongly continuous one-parameter unitary group (or rather its restriction to the time interval $(0,1)$) such that $U_1 = U_0 = \mathbb{1}$; of course, $\tilde{\xi}_{s,t} : \tilde{E}_s \otimes \tilde{E}_t \to \tilde{E}_t \otimes \tilde{E}_s$ is the exchange operator. It follows that for every $\tilde{h} \in \tilde{E}_1$ the function $t \mapsto \langle U_t \tilde{h}, \tilde{h} \rangle$ is (uniformly) continuous on $[0,1]$. We may rewrite it as

$$\langle U_t \tilde{h}, \tilde{h} \rangle = \langle \tilde{\beta}_{t,1-t}(U_t \tilde{h}), \tilde{\beta}_{t,1-t}(\tilde{h}) \rangle = \langle \tilde{\xi}_{1-t,t} \tilde{\beta}_{1-t,t}(\tilde{h}), \tilde{\beta}_{t,1-t}(\tilde{h}) \rangle \, .$$

Given a representation $(\alpha_t)_t$ and a vector $h \in E_1$, we take $\tilde{h} = \alpha_1(h) \in \tilde{E}_1$ and get

$$\begin{gathered} \tilde{\beta}_{t,1-t}(\tilde{h}) = (\alpha_t \otimes \alpha_{1-t})(\beta_{t,1-t}(h)) \, ; \\ \tilde{\xi}_{1-t,t} \tilde{\beta}_{1-t,t}(\tilde{h}) = (\alpha_t \otimes \alpha_{1-t}) \xi_{1-t,t} \beta_{1-t,t}(h) \, ; \end{gathered}$$

thus,

$$\langle U_t \tilde{h}, \tilde{h} \rangle = \langle \xi_{1-t,t} \beta_{1-t,t}(h), \beta_{t,1-t}(h) \rangle$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0,1)$. Also, $\langle U_1 \tilde{h}, \tilde{h} \rangle = \langle U_0 \tilde{h}, \tilde{h} \rangle = \|\tilde{h}\|^2 = \|h\|^2$. $\square$

4.3 Corollary. A rational-time subproduct system satisfying Condition (4) of Theorem 3.1 admits no representation. The same holds for Condition (5).

Proof. We take $h = y_1$ and get $\|h\|^2 = 1$ but

$$\langle \beta_{t,1-t}(h), \xi_{1-t,t}\beta_{1-t,t}(h) \rangle = \langle y_t \otimes x_{1-t}, x_t \otimes y_{1-t} \rangle = 0$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0,1)$. Condition (5) is treated similarly. $\square$

4.4 Lemma. If a rational-time subproduct system satisfying Condition (3) of Theorem 3.1 admits a representation then there exists $b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\eta_t = \mathrm{e}^{ibt}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$.

Proof. It is sufficient to prove that $\eta_t \to 1$ as $t \to 0$, $t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$. We apply Prop. 4.2 to $h = y_1$ and get $\|h\|^2 = 1$ but

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \beta_{t,1-t}(h), \xi_{1-t,t}\beta_{1-t,t}(h) \rangle = \\ &\quad = \langle y_t \otimes x_{1-t} + c^t \eta_t x_t \otimes y_{1-t}, x_t \otimes y_{1-t} + c^{1-t} \eta_{1-t} y_t \otimes x_{1-t} \rangle = \\ &\qquad = c^t \eta_t \|x_t \otimes y_{1-t}\|^2 + \overline{c^{1-t}\eta_{1-t}} \|y_t \otimes x_{1-t}\|^2 = \\ &\qquad\qquad = \eta_t (c^t \|y_{1-t}\|^2 + c^{1-t} \overline{\eta}_1 \|y_t\|^2) \, , \end{aligned}$$

since $\eta_t \eta_{1-t} = \eta_1$ and $\overline{\eta_{1-t}} = 1/\eta_{1-t}$. It remains to note that $c^t \|y_{1-t}\|^2 + c^{1-t} \overline{\eta}_1 \|y_t\|^2 \to 1$ as $t \to 0$, $t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$, since $\|y_t\|^2 \to 0$. $\square$

4.5 Lemma. If a rational-time subproduct system satisfying Condition (1) of Theorem 3.1 admits a representation then $a \ne 0$.

Proof. We define $\tilde h \in \tilde E_1$ by

$$\tilde\beta_{0.5,0.5}(\tilde h) = \alpha_{0.5}(x_{0.5}) \otimes \alpha_{0.5}(y_{0.5})$$

and observe that $\|\tilde h\| = 1$ but $\langle U_t \tilde h, \tilde h \rangle = a^{2t}$ for $t \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 0.5)$. $\square$

4.6 Theorem. For every rational-time subproduct system admitting a representation (in some Arveson system) there exist vectors $x_t, y_t \in E_t$ for $t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$ such that one and only one of the following two conditions (numbered 1, 3) is satisfied.

(1) There exists $a \in (0,1)$ such that for all $s, t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$

$$\begin{gathered} \|x_t\| = \|y_t\| = 1 \, , \quad \langle x_t, y_t \rangle = a^t \, , \\ \beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes x_t \, , \quad \beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t}) = y_s \otimes y_t \, . \end{gathered}$$

(3) There exist $c \in (0, \infty)$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $s, t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$

$$\begin{gathered} \|x_t\| = 1 \, , \quad \langle x_t, y_t \rangle = 0 \, , \\ \|y_t\|^2 = \begin{cases} t & \text{if } c = 1, \\ (c^{2t} - 1)/(c^2 - 1) & \text{if } c \ne 1; \end{cases} \\ \beta_{s,t}(x_{s+t}) = x_s \otimes x_t \, , \quad \beta_{s,t}(y_{s+t}) = y_s \otimes x_t + c^s \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}bs} x_s \otimes y_t \, . \end{gathered}$$

Proof. Combine Theorem 3.1, Corollary 4.3, Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.5. $\square$

4.7 Lemma. Every rational-time subproduct system satisfying Condition (1) of Theorem 4.6 admits a representation in an Arveson system of type I_1.

Proof. It is straightforward: in an Arveson system of type I_1 we choose two units $(u_t)_t$, $(v_t)_t$ such that $\|u_t\| = 1$, $\|v_t\| = 1$ and $\langle u_t, v_t \rangle = a^t$ for all $t \in [0, \infty)$, and let $\alpha_t(x_t) = u_t$, $\alpha_t(y_t) = v_t$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$. $\square$

4.8 Lemma. Every rational-time subproduct system satisfying Condition (3) of Theorem 4.6 admits a representation in an Arveson system of type I_1.

Proof. We take the type I_1 Arveson system of symmetric Fock spaces

$$\tilde{E}_t = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} \big(L_2(0,t) \big)^{\otimes n} = \mathbb{C} \oplus L_2(0,t) \oplus L_2(0,t) \otimes L_2(0,t) \oplus \dots$$

and map E_t into the sum of the first two terms,

$$\begin{gathered} \alpha_t : E_t \to \mathbb{C} \oplus L_2(0,t) \subset \tilde{E}_t \, , \\ \alpha_t(x_t) = 1 \oplus 0 \, , \quad \text{(the vacuum vector)} \\ \alpha_t(y_t) = 0 \oplus f_t \, , \quad f_t \in L_2(0,t) \text{ is defined by} \\ f_t(s) = A c^s \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}bs} \quad \text{for } s \in (0,t) \, , \end{gathered}$$

A being the normalizing constant,

$$A = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } c = 1, \\ \sqrt{\frac{2 \ln c}{c^2 - 1}} & \text{if } c \ne 1. \end{cases}$$

$\square$

A representation (as defined by 4.1) will be called *reducible,* if it is also a representation in a proper Arveson subsystem of the given Arveson system. Otherwise the representation is *irreducible.* All irreducible representations (if any) of a given rational-time subproduct system are mutually isomorphic. In this sense a rational-time subproduct system either extends uniquely to the corresponding Arveson system, or is not embeddable into Arveson systems.

The representations constructed in Lemmas 4.7, 4.8 are evidently irreducible.

4.9 Theorem. If a rational-time subproduct system has an irreducible representation in an Arveson system then the Arveson system is of type I_1.

Proof. Combine Theorem 4.6 and Lemmas 4.7, 4.8. $\square$

References

[1] W. Arveson (2003): *Noncommutative dynamics and E-semigroups,* Springer, New York.

[2] B.V.Rajarama Bhat (2009): *Type of inductive limits of finite-dimensional inclusion systems,* Oberwolfach Report No. 9/2009, p. 47.

[3] B.V.Rajarama Bhat and M. Mukherjee: *Inclusion systems and amalgamated products of product systems* (in preparation).

[4] V. Liebscher (2009): *Random sets and invariants for* (*type II*) *continuous tensor product systems of Hilbert spaces,* Memoirs AMS, no. 930. Also arXiv:math.PR/0306365v1.

[5] Orr Moshe Shalit and Baruch Solel (2009): *Subproduct systems,* arXiv:0901.1422v2.

[6] Boris Tsirelson (2009): *Graded algebras and subproduct systems: dimension two,* arXiv:0905.4418.

Boris Tsirelson
School of Mathematics
Tel Aviv University
Tel Aviv 69978, Israel

`mailto:tsirel@post.tau.ac.il`
`http://www.tau.ac.il/~tsirel/`